

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM Dorris Library 2046

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		17%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	4	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	3	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

This application demonstrates that a small, rural library jurisdiction with limited financial resources can successfully fulfill the requirements of the Library Bond Act regulations as successfully as larger library jurisdictions with more ample financial resources.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Dorris, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	Siskiyou County Free Library
<i>Project Type/Priority:</i>	New Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	3,300
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$533,635

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

Age Rating

- 4 = No Existing Facility
- 4 = 1949 or older
- 3 = 1950-1959
- 2 = 1960-1964
- 1 = 1965-1974
- 0 = 1975-2003

RATING

4

3

4

Structural Renovation Rating

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1954 & earlier
- 3 = 1955-1962
- 2 = 1963-1972
- 1 = 1973-1978
- 0 = 1979-2003

- 4 = Extremely Poor Condition
- 3 = Poor condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Good condition
- 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	4

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: 1959

Library renovation date: None

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

R1:

The two words that summarize the existing facility are "inadequate" and "tiny." The over-crowding causes accessibility issues for all users and provides none for those with disabilities. Access to technology was provided to the public in the form of two PC's provided by the Gates Foundation, but it was at the expense of shelving for library materials and exacerbates the overcrowded conditions. There is no room on the site to expand the facility and no dedicated parking is available.

R2:

This 50 year old wooden structure inexpensively constructed with no subsequent renovations or upgrades and is completely inadequate to serve its current population. Overcrowding causes patrons, particularly the disabled ones to avoid the library altogether. In general, the Dorris library is totally outdated, very tight spatially with no flexibility, cannot accommodate its disabled patrons, and is aesthetically undesirable.

R3:

This 1953 400 sq ft building consists of \$857.00 in materials and a lot of local labor. The community has carefully cared for this 50-year-old structure. A Gates grant added a couple of computers which took away some of the already limited shelving. The bldg is not compliant virtually any code or ADA requirement. Every effort has been made to use this small space to serve the community. It just cannot serve the handicapped residents due to access and restroom issues. If 5-6 patrons crowd into the library the others wait their turn outside. The county library and volunteers have also utilized the space more than its maximum potential.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

4

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	4

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	3
3	2	3
4	4	4
4	4	3
3	3	3

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	3
4	4	4

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	2	2
3	4	4
4	3	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Needs Assessment:

Methods of obtaining broad-based community input were varied and highly successful. Analysis of the data and input is incisive and demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the community, its needs, and how the library can partner with other community agencies to provide the needed services.

Plan of Service:

The plan of service is tailored to this community, is realistic, and demonstrates that the library is fully integrated into the community structure.

Joint Use Agreement:

The agreement demonstrates a genuine partnership between the city, county library, and the school district. The agreement acknowledges the funding realities and indicates a minimum level of service and the intention for long-term continuation of the joint services.

Space Needs Assessment:

Other than the admission of a "somewhat arbitrary" number of technology units for the library, this is overall an excellent space needs assessment for a small rural public library. The allocation and conversion factors were extremely well documented.

Building Program:

While somewhat lacking in detail in some areas, this is never-the-less an excellent general requirements section for a small rural library building program. Exceptionally well stated spatial relationships in narrative form, particularly for a library of this size. A spatial relationships diagram would have been a plus. The individual space descriptions are extremely well documented and appear to be appropriately sized.

Conceptual Plans:

Optimal match between both net-assignable and non-assignable space in the building program and the conceptual plans. It appears the architect brought the building in under program and at 25% non-assignable space versus the 26% non-assignable provided in the program. The conceptual plans appear to meet most all of the critical spatial relationships called for in the building program. Overall an excellent response to the program by the architect.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

R2:

Needs Assessment:

They did an outstanding job for such a small community, with limited resources. Used varied methods, reaching most segments of the community. Their Library Building Committee, which made the compromises on what needs defined could realistically be addressed by the library, was made up of community members as well as members of the library, city, and county. The presentation was excellent, making it very clear how many people were reached by different methods (total of 261 people). While there is undoubtedly some overlap among respondents to the different methods, this number is well over 10% of their service population. The community analysis was excellent. They know their community and the community knows, appreciates, and really needs the library. For example: "The children of Butte Valley have few opportunities to expand their knowledge of the world outside their homes and schools. ... Television, when they have it, is their primary source of outside information. If the children are to break the cycle of poverty and low educational achievement that their families are in, they need access to more information, more technology, and more positive cultural experiences. Even a well stocked and attractive library cannot turn every child's life around, but it can make a significant difference." And: "Several Hispanic women are so anxious for this project to succeed that they provided a Mexican dinner as a fund raiser. It raised over \$1,000 for the Butte Valley Friends of the Library Building Fund." The analysis of service needs was excellent and not overlong. It did an exceptional job of summarizing the results by group consulted and then indicating which ones the planning committee felt were realistic for the library to address and which one not. The facility problems result in extreme service limitations, which are thoughtfully and objectively presented. The space needs assessment follows the Needs Assessment priorities, and their rationales for sizes they propose and the compromises they made are both clear and realistic.

Plan of Service:

The project is extremely responsive and yet realistic and straightforward about the compromises they have to make and what realistically the mission of the public library is. For example: A full kitchen was requested by the Hispanic interest group and the Seniors group, but this request was considered and rejected by the Building Committee. They decided that full meals were beyond the scope of the library's mission, and would lead to unacceptably high building and maintenance costs. On an experimental basis, food may be allowed in the Multipurpose Room while it is in use as a Homework Center, but that has not been decided." The content of the goals, objectives, etc. was fine; the form of them was a bit lacking. The service descriptions were very clear, well presented, and concisely stated. The fit into the jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service was very well presented and realistic.

Joint Use Agreement: Given the conditions of Siskiyou County and the Dorris area, this is an excellent example of a mutually-beneficial partnership that assesses their situations realistically and then honestly makes the commitments that they can actually commit to, without masking the potential problems in a lot of verbiage. There are realistic and equitable contributions from the city, the county library, and the school district. They are up front in saying that budget reductions may negatively impact the amount of dollars available in the future for this joint venture. However, they also look to possible alternatives should those problems occur: more trained volunteers and additional grant funds.

Building Program:

Coverage of electronic technologies in the Building Program to implement the Plan of Service is fairly brief, but it is probably just fine for this small branch. The Building Program for this small rural library is extremely good in describing the general requirements, spatial relationships between the individual spaces, and descriptions of the individual spaces. It would help communicate more clearly to include a bubble diagram.

Conceptual Plan:

The net and non-assignable square footage is an excellent response to the Building Program requirements. The spatial relationships match the Building Program exceptionally well with few discrepancies. Might be better to back same height shelving together. Spanish language and Juvenile shelving different heights.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

R3:

Needs Assessment:

Dorris has a population of 868 people and the current facility is 400 sq. ft. The methodology used to gather community input was excellent and multi faceted--included community meetings, surveys to local groups, stores, city hall, and visits to classes in schools to gather input directly from students who were asked what kinds of services they would want to see in a new library. Although the number of community agencies in such a small town is limited, lists included service needs. They were also able to explain why they could not respond to a need from the community that related to having a full service kitchen in the proposed facility. The community analysis was excellent as was the description of service limitations (there were many including the number of chairs in the children's department (2)

Plan of Service:

Proposed services are clearly defined and are extremely responsive and linked directly to findings in the needs assessment. Goals, objectives, and service indicators are clearly presented.

Building Program:

Young Adult area is located away from the children's department which should encourage use by teens since they don't consider themselves to be children.

Joint Use Agreement:

Proposed minimum hours are listed and they have committed to making every effort to keep the homework center accessible. Looks like a sincere effort by both parties to provide staffing. Indicate that they will pursue grant funds for program enhancements. This agreement shows a sincere effort by both parties to make a partnership that will really work for their community.

Building program:

The general requirements are very well done and are done at an appropriate level of detail (or lack of detail) for a very small facility. Sensible requirements for scope of project (e.g., two thermostats will suffice - one in the public room, one in the meeting room). Space adjacencies are appropriate. Room sheets are generally very good, and are responsive to the needs of a small facility with a single regular staff member on duty.

Conceptual Plans:

Assignable sq. ft. is close to the building program. Gross sq. ft.: a rough measurement indicates about 3,700 sq. ft. footprint. With 3,144 assignable sq. ft. required per the building program, that's an excellent 15% efficiency. Spatial relationships match the building Program.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

Integration of Electronic Technologies

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING

3

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	3
3	2	2
3	3	3

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The planning documents demonstrate a thorough understanding of the technology solutions needed by the community as well as the realities and difficulties in providing adequate telecommunications solutions in this remote area. It is particularly noteworthy that planning includes distance learning opportunities.

R2:

Overall a very good job dealing with the practicalities of the remote location and difficulties of predicting the future in that environment. The Building Program discussion of electronic technologies is rather brief, but it is probably just fine for this small branch.

R3:

Have done a very good job at proposing technology solutions within the confines of their remote location.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

Site

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

4

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

N/A

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	4	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	3
4	4	4
3	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	3

N/A

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	4	4
4	4	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: The City of Dorris will install a storm sewer system at the site and the building will be built on a foundation that will be higher than the surrounding area.

Geotechnical issues: The Geotechnical report results will not prevent use of the planned site for a library, nor significantly increase the building costs.

R1:

The proposed site for the Dorris library will be in the northeast corner of the Butte Valley service area, however, Dorris is the major community in the service area and the only incorporated city. Approximately 1/3 of the population in the service area live in and around Dorris.

Hwy 97 (4,350 vehicles per day) is the major road in the area and runs from I-5 north of Redding to Klamath Fall, Oregon both of which are the major shopping areas for the residents of the service area. Most people (90%) in Dorris live on the western side of Hwy 97 where the library will be located. The library is located on the corner of Third Street (the second most busy street in the City and Triangle. Both sides of Third Street have sidewalks and children from the nearby preschool, elementary and high school will be able to easily walk to the library. There is a mini-mall 4 blocks from the proposed site and the Post Office is 5 blocks from the site. The City Hall which is on Hwy 97 is also nearby. There will be 10 bicycle parking spaces near the front entrance, and they are under shelter!

There is no public transit currently available in Dorris.

There will be 10 parking spaces on site (which meets local code) and 8 additional spaces off-site, but within 500' of the front door.

The library will be at the end of one of the communities busiest streets. The library building will be one of the most prominent buildings in town. While the building may not be as visible as it would be on Hwy 97, the community has had several public meetings that were very well attended and the residents feel very strongly about not locating the library on the Highway. Given the very small size of Dorris and the fact that literally everyone in the town will know where the library is located, the "visibility" of the site is not a significant issue in this case. Further, the proposed site will have a commanding view of Mt Shasta which is highly desirable in this community.

Both the application and conceptual plans show a plan to expand both the building and parking in the future which is excellent long term planning.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Dorris Library 2046

R2:

Site is 6 blocks from Hwy 97. No area plan is provide, but a quick look at the map indicates it's at the west edge of town, and most of the residents live on the west side. Application form says that 3rd St. includes several of the principal public buildings in Dorris.

Students can walk on sidewalks, or bike to the building without difficulty on 3rd St.

Dorris has a parking ordinance, and the project complies. Convenient additional street parking is always available. Ten bike slots will be provided, and are shown next to the entry.

The Library will be quite visible. Cars on Hwy. 97 will not see it, however, so attractive signs there will be needed.

The site selection process considered other sites, including one on Hwy. 97. The decision was made that 97 was too noisy and dangerous, and the west side, easy to walk to from school, shopping, most residences, etc., made the most sense. Local residents turned out en masse to have the site officially adopted.

Site size is over 6X footprint. It is a nearly-square rectangle on a street corner, easy to use for footprint, parking, etc. Surrounding area not shown, but text description indicates it is quite convenient to most residents and civic buildings. The site remains flexible for expansion.

R3:

While not in the center of the service area (northeast Siskiyou County), Dorris is the largest community in the service area and is on Highway 97, the only major road in this remote rural area. There is no public transit. Pedestrian access will be very good from nearby schools and the clinic. The site is on Third Street, one of Dorris' two major business streets, the other being Highway 97 itself, some 7 blocks to the east. Automobile parking is excellent for a 3,300 sq. ft. facility, with 10 spaces on site/off street, 4 more off site/off street, and an additional 4 off site/on street. 10 spaces are provided for bicycles, though none appear to be sheltered. the library will be very visible within the city, at the west end of one of the major business streets. the site is well chosen to place the library in close proximity to schools and the Butte Valley Health and Dental Clinic. A site on Highway 97 was considered and rejected by the community as being to exposed to traffic hazards. The site allows for future expansion of both the building and parking.

EVALUATION FORM
Dorris Library 2046

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.